## Remarks

## Claim Objection

Claim 15 was objected to because of a typographical error. A phrase containing the error has been deleted from the claim.

## **Obviousness Rejections**

Claims 1–3, 5–8, 11–13, and 15 stand rejected as being obvious over US Patent No. 4,674,149 to Vetter in view of US Patent No. 4,364,201 to Taylor. Vetter is credited with disclosing all of the subject matter of the three independent claims 1, 5, and 15 with the exception of the claimed shoe. Vetter discloses a shoe, but the shoe element of Vetter is considered as the claimed "support extension". The Examiner finds the missing shoe in Taylor.

The claimed support extension is said to be fixedly connected to the claimed track. Vetter's supposed support extension is not fixed — it slides as the shoe that it is. Taylor does not disclose a support extension. The equated first and second links of Taylor are pivotally mounted on a common boss. If Vetter were to look to Taylor about how to pivotally mount two links from a fixed position, he would learn to mount the links from a common boss. Thus, neither reference considered individually or together suggests pivotally connecting first and second links to a support extension that is fixedly connected to the track.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to define the track as having a length as well as a width and to require the support extension to extend beyond the length of the track. Neither Vetter nor Taylor disclose a support extension that extends beyond the

US Application No 10/619,108

length of a track. Claim 1 has also been amended to require both the first and second links to be pivotally connected to the support extension beyond the length of the track. Neither Vetter nor Taylor remotely suggest this as a possibility.

Independent claim 5 has been amended to require the claimed planar bearing surface of the support extension to underlie the entire given length of the first link in the closed position. When either Vetter or Taylor is faced with a requirement to mount a link about a pivot fixed to their tracks, both employ simple rivets or boss-mounted pin arrangements that do not include any underlying planar bearing surfaces for their links, and show no appreciation for the advantages of doing so. Moreover, neither provides any sort of teaching that such a bearing surface should underlie the entire length of the claimed first link in the closed position.

Dependent claims 6 and 14 require the support extension to include an integral end cap. Neither of the applied references of Vetter and Taylor suggest use of the claimed support extension for separately mounting the claimed first and second links from fixed pivot axes. Neither of these applied references suggest that an end cap should be an integral part of the support extension.

Dependent claim 11 as now amended requires a first of two apertures in the support extension to be located beyond a length of the track for fastening the extended portion to a window frame and a second of the two apertures in extended portion being aligned with an aperture in the track for fastening the extended portion to the track and to the window frame. Vetter and Taylor are silent about such extended portions and make no suggestions for extended portions having one aperture beyond the length of their tracks and another aperture aligned with an aperture in their tracks.

US Application No 10/619,108

Dependent claim 13 as currently amended requires the claimed first and second links to include contacting surfaces that engage each other to form a stop to limit movement of the hinge assembly beyond a predetermined open configuration. Support for this amendment is found in the first full paragraph of page 11 and in the detailed view of Figure 5. No such stop is found in Vetter or Taylor.

Independent claim 15 has been amended to require the claimed planar bearing surface of the support extension to underlie at least one-half of one of the first and second links in their closed positions. Support for this amendment is found in the first paragraph of page 8 of the subject specification. Neither Vetter nor Taylor employ planar bearing surfaces for their links mounted from fixed pivot points, and neither can be cited for suggesting what portions of the lengths of their links such a planar bearing surface should underlie.

Dependent claim 16 has been added specifying that the bearing surface of the extended portion underlies at least one-half of the given length of the second link. No such structure is found in or suggested by Vetter or Taylor.

Claims 4, 8, and 9 stand rejected as being obvious over the same combination of Vetter and Taylor in further view of Stavenau et al. Claim 4 depends from independent claim 1 and claims 8 and 9 depend from independent claim 5. Although Stavenau et al. show gearing rotationally relating two links, Stavenau et al. do not disclose the missing details of the claimed extended portion and its claimed relationship with links. The fixed pivot point of Stavenau et al.'s track is illustrated as a simple pin or rivet and is not formed in an extended portion having a planar bearing surface providing underlying support for the links.

US Application No 10/619,108

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 10 and 14 are objected to only as to their form and are deemed allowable

if rewritten to include all of the limitations of their base claim and any intervening claim.

Both claims have been rewritten in independent form incorporating all of the limitations

of their base claim 5 from which they each depend.

The Examiner is thanked for the careful consideration given to these claims and

the application.

\* \*

In view of the above, all of the pending claims 1-16 are believed in condition for

allowance. Reconsideration of the rejected claims and allowance of all pending claims

are respectfully requested. For any questions on this response or the application, the

Examiner is invited to contact applicants' representative at the telephone number given

below.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas B. Ryan, Registration No. 31,659

HARTER, SECREST & EMERY LLP

1600 Bausch & Lomb Place

Rochester, New York 14604

Telephone: 585-231-1101

Fax: 585-232-2152

February 15, 2005

11